

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated 23 January 2004 has been reviewed, and the comments of the U.S. Patent Office have been considered. Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,422,283 to *Scanland*; claims 3, 12 and 13, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Scanland* and U.S. Patent No. 4,930,298 to *Zenner*; claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Scanland* and U.S. Patent No. 5,157,908 to *Sebben et al. (Sebben)*; and claim 35 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1-12, and 18-33 are pending.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1-3 and 12 because *Scanland*, *Sebben*, and *Zenner*, whether combined or alone, fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention as a whole, as recited in each of independent claim 1. The Office Action objected to claim 35, noting it is allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 35, which depends from claim 1, has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claim 1 has been amended to include the canceled features of claim 35. Therefore, newly amended claim 1 contains the exact features the Office Action indicated were allowable in claim 35. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Morevoer, neither *Zenner* nor *Sebben* taken singly or in combination, overcome the deficiencies of *Scanland*. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

Additionally, claims 2, 3, and 12, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable at least because their base claim is allowable, as well as for the additional features recited therein. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 12 be withdrawn.

Applicant cancels claims 13, 16, 17, 34, and 35 without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn as moot.

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 4-11 and 18-33 are allowable.

In view of the amendment to independent claim 1, the cancellation of claims 13, 16, 17, 34, and 35, and the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of the application and timely allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of the application.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. **This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a)(3).**

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell, Esq.
Reg. No. 33,652

Date: March 3, 2004

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel. 202.739.3000
Fax 202.739.3001